Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/809,825	SAITOH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Bryan P. Ready	2852		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 4_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply originals.	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate analy set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as	
NOTICE OF APPEAL				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	-	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	kplanation of	
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-16</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. ⊠ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/David M Gray/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2852				
•				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants assert Baldwin '195 fails to wholly satisfy Applicant's claims regarding the operation of the hand-held device. Specifically, Applicants assert Baldwin's hand-held device does not receive a preventive maintenenance instruction from the printer itself, but rather a maintenance workstation. In response, Examiner asserts the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Examiner asserts that Yamashita '009 discloses (Fig. 1) receiving preventive maintenance information directly from a printer and transmitting this information to a host device for printer management. Baldwin's analogue to Yamashita's host device is Baldwin's maintenance terminal 32, which is seen to transmit display information to the hand-held terminal used in servicing peripheral printer devices (Baldwin; Abstract). Further, Applicants assert Examiner's cited text of Yamashita et al. fails to disclose preventive maintenance, but rather replacement maintenance required when a component has been used beyond its lifetime. In response, Exmainer asserts that replacement of a component before such component fails can be considered preventive maintenance. Further, throughout the specification Yamashita et al. refer to a "PM" call, which is understood to be an acronym for the term "preventive maintenance".